



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
• Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,501	11/24/2003	Timothy Marc Francis	RSW920030287US1	4565
36736 7590 04/06/2007 DUKE W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			04/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,501

Applicant(s)

FRANCIS ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. The language of claims 1-21 raise a question as to whether the claims are abstract ideas and would not result in practical application producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101. For example, runtime code, a concrete bean, a injector, a bean adapter binding, a function set, an extractor, a data cache entry are abstract ideas that do not produce any tangible result<e.g. just a thought or just a computation within a processor which does not provide an output thereby creating a tangible result which enables the usefulness to be realized>.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2194

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeluripati et al (US. 7,086,065 B1) in view of Sudarshan et al (Us. 2002/0004850 A1).

As to claim 1, Yeluripati teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a call (calls, col 15, ln 10-11), a client (client, col 8, ln 15-25), a container managed persistence bean (container, col 15-20), receiving a call from a client to manipulate an instance of a container managed persistence bean (col 8, ln 15-20, ln 22-28), a set of generated code (function bean, col 6, ln 27-30), wherein the call is received using a set of generated code (col 6, ln 27-30), bean specific functions including bean specific methods for a bean type (type of function bean, col 6, ln 27-30/ col 8, ln 61-65), wherein the set of generated code is designed to perform bean specific functions including bean specific methods for a bean type(col 6, ln 27-30/ col 8, ln 61-65), and interfacing with a backend(col 8, ln 56-58); and processing the call through a set between the set of generated code and the runtime code(col 8, ln 50-60), a set of calls(the APIs , col 13, ln 51-55), wherein the runtime code performs the functions, which are performed in a manner that is nonspecific to a bean type(col 8, ln 55-60).

Yeluripati does not explicitly teach managing input parameters for the bean specific methods, processing a result of bean finders; and returning a result to the client. However, Sudardhan teaches managing input parameters for the bean specific methods, processing a result of bean finders; and returning a result to the client (method call includes the name of the method to be invoked and the parameters and is transferred to the EJB enabled server, para [0066], ln 15-23/ asynchronous lookup for the EJB methods like getHandle, etc. Some more methods besides the ones mentioned above may also be seen in the interface, e.g., releaseMessagaging Service-a

Art Unit: 2194

utility method which could be used by the client system for performing certain operations, para [0042], ln 4-9).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sudardhan to incorporate the features managing input parameters for the bean specific methods, processing a result of bean finders; and returning a result to the client because this providing an achieve container managed asynchronous functionality between the client system and the EJB-enabled server.

As to claim 2, Yeluripati teaches the instance of a container-managed persistence bean is manipulated using a set of bean specific methods that apply to an instance of the container manage persistence bean (col 8, ln 52-54/ ln 61-65).

As to claim 4, Sudardhan teaches the backend is a database or other data storage system (col 8, ln 45-49).

As to claim 5, Yeluripati teaches wherein the set of bean specific methods includes creating, storing, deleting and finding a bean (para [0009], ln 6-9).

4. Claims 3, 6-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeluripati et al (US. 7,086,065 B1) in view of Sudarshan et al (US. 2002/0004850 A1) and further in view of Chen et al (US. 2003/0182307 A1).

As to claim 3, Yeluripati teaches a concrete bean (col 8, ln 39-45), a function set (col 8, ln 60-65) and Sudarshan teaches a bean adapter binding (para [0042], ln 4-8).

Art Unit: 2194

Yeluripati and Sudarshan do not teach injector, an extractor, and a data cache entry. However, Chen teaches injector, an extractor, a data cache entry (the resultant data is converted into an entity bean 116 and returned from the database in response to this request 114, para [0031], ln 3-7/ the second request is also converted into an entity bean 124 and placed in cache 118, para [0031], ln 7-11).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sudardhan, Yeluripati to incorporate the features injector, an extractor, a data cache entry because this allowing the client may quickly and easily retrieve the information from caches.

As to claim 6, Yeluripati teaches a backend (col 2, ln 52-55).

As to claim 7, Chen teaches converting the data into a format used by the instance of a container managed persistence bean ([para 0031], ln 1-10).

As to claim 8, Chen teaches input parameters for the bean specific methods includes converting input parameters from a format used by the instance of a container managed persistence bean to a formatted input for use in accessing a backend (right col 6, ln 43-48).

As to claim 9, it is an apparatus claim of claims 1, 3, 6-8; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 3, 6-8.

As to claim 10, Yeluripati teaches the concrete bean receives requests to locate container managed persistence beans and processes the requests by calling the runtime code (col 8, ln 49-55);

As to claim 11, Sudarshan teaches the concrete bean locates a bean by finding a bean (para [0042], ln 4-11).

As to claim 12, Yeluripati teaches by creating a container managed persistence bean associated with a bean type, but not associated with a specific bean instance (col 8, ln 55-65).

As to claim 13, Sudarshan teaches a plurality of container managed persistence beans (para [0038], ln 1-13).

As to claim 14, Chen teaches the data includes at least one of a Java primitive and an object reference (para [0021], ln 1-9).

As to claim 15, Yeluripati teaches the backend is a database or other data storage system (col 2, ln 52-55).

As to claim 16, Yeluripati teaches the concrete bean includes a custom bean type (col 8, ln 60-65).

As to claim 17, Yeluripati teaches the runtime code is shared by the plurality of bean types (col 8, ln 60-65).

As to claim 18, Yeluripati teaches backend specific data access logic (col 2, ln 50-55).

As to claim 19, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

As to claim 20, Yeluripati teaches the inherited bean specific functions are written by a specific bean type provider (col 8, ln 55-60).

As to claim 21, Yeluripati teaches the inherited bean specific functions perform additional logic (col 8, ln 50-55).

As to claims 24, 27, they are apparatus claims of claims 3, 6; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 6 above.

Art Unit: 2194

As to claims 22, 23, 25-26, 28, 29, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 above.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

April 2, 2007


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER